



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,477	07/19/2001	Francois Rey	11345.033001	5625
22511 7590 07/08/2009 OSHA LIANG L.L.P. TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER KAVLESKI, RYAN C				
ART UNIT 2419		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/08/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/831,477

Applicant(s)

REY ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan C. Kavleski

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-15, 30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-15, 30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/20/2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendments

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's reply filed under 37 CFR 1.111 on 4/20/2009. Claims 1,13,30 and 31 were amended and claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31 remain pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation "in which a bouquet related table corresponds to a bouquet association table" should correctly changed to "in which [[a]] the at least two bouquet related tables corresponds to [[a]] bouquet association tables." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Regarding claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31, the limitation “transmitting in one packet transport stream one additional table comprising a list of bouquet identity values associated with the bouquet related tables carried for the one transport stream” is indefinite because it is unclear to what the additional table is that would comprise the “bouquet identity values”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 1,2,6-11,13,15,30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the European Telecommunication Standard (“Specification for Service Information in Digital Video Broadcasting Systems”)(ETS hereafter) in view of Arai et al. (US 7,516,467)(Arai hereafter).

Regarding claims 1,13,30 and 31, the ETS teaches a method of transmission of digital information in a digital communication network, the network comprising a plurality of

packet transport streams (service information is carried as data through digital video broadcast bitstreams)[page 7 section 1][page 13 section 5.1.2] each carrying at least one bouquet related table (bouquet association table (BAT)) containing information relating to a commercial bouquet [page 17 section 5.2.2],

transmitting, in one of at least one of the plurality of transport streams, two different bouquet related tables (BAT and service description table (SDT)) each comprising information related to a respective different commercial bouquet (multiplex of services)(the BAT provides a list of services and a SDT describes services within a system)[page 10 section 4].

However, ETS doesn't explicitly disclose transmitting in the one transport stream one additional table comprising bouquet identity values associated with the bouquet related tables carried for the one transport stream and the bouquet identity values used to identify the at least two bouquet related tables from within the at least one packet transport stream to enable a given one of the at least two bouquet related tables to be downloaded from the at least one packet transport stream.

Arai teaches, in the field of preparing and transmitting information for program retrieval, that electronic program information and broadcast service provider information is transmitted in groups to be decoded and demultiplexed at a user [column 28 lines 27-46], this information containing an event information table (EIT) that comprises information of one or more programs of a channel service that would be further described in a service descriptor table (SDT) [column 29 lines 2-9], a BAT extracted

based upon a particular program in a bouquet to be watched by a user [column 29 lines 28-46].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the disclosure of ETS for sending service information data in a bitstream to provide a user with information to select a service within the bitstream to combine with the teachings of Arai to be able to multiplex multiple services from multiple service providers to a user for the use of selecting specific electronic program tables corresponding to desired information. One would be motivated to do so to provide the ability to distinguish between individual program guides for different services when multiple services are multiplexed [refer Arai; column 1 lines 10-16].

Regarding claim 2, the ETS teaches a bouquet related table corresponds to a bouquet association table containing information regarding the services present in a commercial bouquet [page 17 section 5.2.2].

Regarding claims 6 and 15, the ETS teaches a transport stream specific table (service description table (SDT)) is transmitted in the one packet transport stream, the transport stream specific table comprising a list of bouquet identity values (a bouquet lists services which are described within the service description table)[page 10 last paragraph] associated with that particular transport stream [page 19 section 5.2.3].

Regarding claim 7, the ETS teaches a transport stream specific table corresponds to a service description table, used to convey information regarding the services carried in the one transport stream [page 19 section 5.2.3].

Regarding claim 8, the ETS teaches bouquet identity values are further associated with each of the services listed in the service description table (a bouquet lists services which are described within the service description table)[page 10 last paragraph].

Regarding claim 9, the ETS teaches transmitting in one transport stream a table (BAT) comprising a list of bouquet identity values associated with another transport stream (a BAT contains the identity of a transport stream)[page 19 paragraph 5].

Regarding claim 10, the ETS teaches all bouquet association tables in a network are identified with a predetermined packet id (PID) [page 17 section 5.2.2] and table id value (table_id) [page 16 table 4].

Regarding claim 11, the ETS teaches a bouquet association table is identified by a table id extension value (bouquet_ID), this value corresponding to the bouquet identity value [page 8 paragraph 16, page 16 table 4].

2. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over ETS in view of Bennett in further view of Cartwright et al. ("Issues in Multiplex

and Service Management in Digital Multichannel Broadcasting”)(Cartwright hereafter).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, the ETS teaches a generalized table (network information table (NIT))[page 15 section 5.2.1] is provided, this generalized table being transmitted in each of the corresponding transport streams in the network (wherein a NIT conveys information relating to transport streams carried within a given network)[page 15 section 5.2.1].

However the ETS fails to disclose a NIT comprising a list of bouquet identity values associated with a plurality of the transport streams in the network.

Carwright teaches that in a broadcasting system, program specific information and service information are sent as data in tables, one of which being a network information table (NIT) that can comprise of an optional list detailing services for a transport stream for a network [page 310 PSI and Si Table Summary: Network Information Table NIT].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the disclosure of the ETS for a standard in Digital Video Broadcasting systems using service information descriptions, such as a network information table to combine and use the optional services list within a network information table as disclosed by Cartwright. One would be motivated to do so to provide information to a customer

regarding the network, transport stream and other related information in digital video broadcasting [refer Cartwright; page 310 Introduction].

Regarding claim 4, the ETS teaches the generalized table corresponds to a network information table used to convey information regarding all the transport streams in the network (a NIT conveys information relating to transport streams carried within a given network) [page 15 section 5.2.1].

Regarding claim 5, the ETS teaches an at least one packet transport stream comprising a generalised table (network information table (NIT))[page 15 section 5.2.1] associated with at least some of the transport streams of another network (an NIT can be transmitted for and refer to other networks in addition to an actual network)[page 15 section 5.2.1].

However ETS fails to disclose a NIT comprising a list of bouquet identity values associated with at least some of the transport streams.

Carwright teaches that in a broadcasting system, program specific information and service information are sent as data in tables, one of which being a network information table (NIT) that can comprise of an optional list detailing services for a transport stream for a network [page 310 PSI and Si Table Summary: Network Information Table NIT].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the disclosure of the ETS for a standard in Digital Video Broadcasting systems using service information descriptions, such as a network information table to combine and use the optional services list within a network information table as disclosed by Cartwright. One would be motivated to do so to provide information to a customer regarding the network, transport stream and other related information in digital video broadcasting [refer Cartwright; page 310 Introduction].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "multiple BAT's (i.e. bouquet association tables) in a single transport stream") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan C. Kavleski whose telephone number is 571-270-

3619 and fax number is 571-270-4619. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang T. Ton can be reached on 571-272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Kavleski
/R. C. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/DANG T TON/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419/D. T. T./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419